

## Comment Form Transcription February 11, 2009—Eagle Open House Comment Form

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	<b>1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.</b>	<b>2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?</b>	<b>3. Additional comments:</b>
1	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route?		
2	How much right-of-way may be needed construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Parks and recreation areas?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- provide east/west commute option between Canyon &amp; Ada/Eagle in an expeditious manner.</li> <li>- provide east/west cycling options that are separate from the commuting vehicle traffic – i.e. – please stay away from Floating Feather, etc. as the Hw 44 route.</li> </ul>	
3	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses?	Limiting access to the Hwy!	
4	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Wetlands?	Please stay as far as possible away from the Boise River.	My family lost their/our farm to the west end of the Eagle Alternative Route. The man that represented ITD in the land acquisition was rude – horrible actually.
5		Don't put the road thru Star – by pass it please! I prefer a northern route – Ballantyne or Floating Feather.	Hwy 16 to Interstate. Eagle to Hwy 16 please get it done!!

#	1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.	2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?	3. Additional comments:
6	How much right-of-way may be needed construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Other – Animals – on the river corridor which is Hwy 44.	Slower Traffic On this Corridor – I know this sounds crazy but it is not like Eagle Rd – We are along the river and so are many species of animals – Birds – “Bird of Prey”	
7	Yes. Is the route consistent with regional, city and counting planning documents?	Limit access as much as possible to facilitate the through traffic the state highway carries.	
8	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Wetlands? Other – Existing rerouting plan not addressed at the Ballantyne/SH44 realignment site.	Safety & traffic signals that are needed for safety seem to be less important than a straight nonstop route.	
9	How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Parks and recreation areas?		
10	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? Obtain ROW for future 5 lane express way. What impacts would a route have on:	Establish concepts of access management and get local planning & elected officials to buy in so development fits into access management long range plan.	Plan for future signal spacing at not less than ½ mile + median U-Turns @ ¼ mile points. Provide for a transit corridor. All options need to look at long range – like 50 to 60 yrs from now – what will this area look like and how should be served by transportation once all the adjacent properties are developed.

#	1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.	2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?	3. Additional comments:
	Homes and businesses? Limited Access – either Frontage Roads, Backage Roads, Parallel/Secondary Access Cultural sites? Preserve Wetlands? Preserve or use wetlands banking. Parks and recreation areas? Incorporate river access & bikeway into plan.		EIS/Location will take 10 years – 2020. Initial Projects will take 10 more years – 2030. So you have to look ahead to 2050/2060 – What are the transportation needs when area is fully developed.
11	How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Other – Planned development	Cost of construction.	
12	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county <u>planning documents</u> ? – Poor Judgement What impacts would a route have on: Other – You asked the wrong questions – Nampa now claims 64,000 people Caldwell has also increased but has barriers to Southern expansion. There is virtually no employment expansion both in Nampa & Caldwell – roads to & out of Boise feed bedroom communities & minor growth in employment. Solve those problems & keep 44 expanding mildly! It is a <u>small</u> traffic pattern – run them to Hiway 20 + expand there!		
13	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route?	That whatever is decided in the plan considers growth demands far enough out.	

#	1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.	2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?	3. Additional comments:
14		The main issue here is do not go thru any towns. No reason to build wide roads if you're going to slow traffic to 25 miles per hour. Build bypasses. Merchants cannot control where roads are built. The public should control	
15		<u>Public Transport</u> should be started as soon as possible. Less costly in the long run.	
16		A public transport system with incentives to use it, would be a cheaper option.	
17		Please look to bike and pedestrian safety when planning. I see that the new park and ride lot in Eagle now has a crosswalk and light which is good. Unfortunately that road is so busy that I would feel uncomfortable crossing it. We may not have much bus service today (1 per day in the AM, 1 in the PM) but surely that will change. Bus stops will be more safely accessible from the north side of the road – there's more population in Eagle to the north – The Winco parking lot would be a good place for a bus stop. If routes are safe then more people will feel comfortable to walk.	
18	What impacts would a route have on: Other – I think we should stop condemning peoples homes! NOT RIGHT!!	Yes, to think ahead to have public transportation in mind, but turn outs, pedestrian bridges, bike access. All play an important role in street design. Light Rail access, along the roads, when time is right to put trains in use. As I see it we are <u>only</u>	

#	1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.	2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?	3. Additional comments:
		thinking of car/truck traffic, with not looking at other way of getting around. Yes, car/truck is important but, let's think ahead. Also, think of large/fast – small/slow traffic. <u>So</u> many roads are becoming freeways like, Eagle Road. I don't own a car, I ride scooter and a motorcycle and would like to have some slower areas. More bike access. Thanks for your time.	
19	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? What impacts would a route have on: Cultural sites? Wetlands? Hazardous material sites? (just clean them up) Parks and recreation areas? Other – preserve the river corridor! It will only become more valuable to all (people & wildlife) in the future.	All access points should be right turn only. Then every ¼ to ½ mile a left U-turn should be permitted and also at lights. A center median would prevent left turn access and crossing multiple lanes for both safety and a higher speed.	Bike paths and walking paths are a must, and must be part of contiguous plan, not just segments in isolation. Noise walls may need to be erected near some residential areas.
20	What impacts would a route have on: Cultural sites? Wetlands? Other – Recreational cycling. Other – Preservation of undeveloped area along the river.	If you could carefully assess and make adjustments to preserve recreational cycling I would much appreciate it, as would many others in the valley. Restricting access on 44 would require added access elsewhere.	I'd like to see improved transit alternatives along 44 – improved bus coverage, light rail as an alternative, e.g. Good access along this route to downtown Boise would be a huge benefit. The entire length of this project should have a center median strip that can only be crossed at specified points. This would greatly reduce accidents. Also please coordinate closely with the ACHD bikeway project. This may be a great opportunity to positively impact bicycle commuting

#	1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.	2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?	3. Additional comments:
			and protect recreational cycling opportunities.
21	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses?	If <u>possible &amp; reasonable</u> build road around Star & Middleton. If new road requires purchase of MANY subdivision R/W's – Use existing R/W.	I think the road should be constructed on the existing routes with adequate left turn options and with run outs for existing roads on the right side. Traffic lights constructed in towns & access to subdivisions should be adequate in numbers for safety & coordinated or timed to maximize traffic flow. Please minimize time and dollars spent on studies & <u>BUILD THE ROAD</u> . THANKS for your consideration. Do not waste time Or money on the three bridges over the Boise River.
22	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses?	The two Southern Routes have environmental constraints. Going through downtown will not allow for the orderly and natural growth of the central area of the city. As well will kill the walkability the city is trying to promote.	The North Route Option 1 is the best route for a host of reasons, first not disrupting the downtown core, second it has fewer R/W constraints, mostly bare land and three it confines and defines the city growth pattern providing the emphasis for transit options in the future.
23			
24			
25			

## Comment Form Transcription

### February 11, 2009—Eagle Open House

### Segment 1: I-84 to Canyon Lane

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
1	No	Best. Stay with it. Most cost effective.	No	No	
2		How do you accommodate existing highway access?			
3	No need to divert route.	Preferred section impacts least amount of ground.	No need to divert route.		
4	I feel sorry for all the homes, private land you want to run a road thru!	Just widen it like all the other damn roads you turn into super freeways!!	Stay off the river, why do we want to destroy this Great River!		
5			Needs to preserve a wide green belt.		
6		Any of these options must allow for easy access for recreational cyclists wishing to cross from north to south at Freezeout or Canyon, e.g.	A number of recreational bicyclists use Channel Rd. to access Caldwell and other connections in the valley. This route would cause a nasty implication for those		

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
			cyclists.		
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					



## Comment Form Transcription

### February 11, 2009—Eagle Open House

### Segment 2: Canyon Lane to Duff Lane

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	<b>1. North route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>2. Existing route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>3. South route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
1	No, too many existing structures. Too costly.	Need alternative to expedite E/W traffic.	South Route appears to be the only and viable (____) route. I support it.	No	South Best
2			This route looks favorable to me by bypassing downtown Middleton with as little impact as possible.		
3	I like Floating Feather or Ballantyne. Please put Hwy 16 to interstate!	Star!!! Stay out of it! Traffic is ridiculous 25 mi per hour thru town.	Too many bridges – more money.	I'm so glad the governor is driving State Street – perhaps this will get done!!!	
4			Route adopted in City's Comprehensive Plan		
5	Goes through too many small properties & would have a big negative impact on the City neighborhoods.	Get H44 out of the City!!	Best choice by far – minimize traffic lights & curb cuts to keep speed limits higher & move regional traffic – utilize frontage &		

#	1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?	5 Additional Comments:
			backage roads.		
6	Accommodation of access.	Accommodation of access.	Appears to provide potential for partial access control.		
7	Too many homes disturbed increases cost significantly.	Not enough right of way. Would impact Businesses too much.	This Route has already Been Planned for and has the least impacts.		
8	Stay out of going thru private property and condemning peoples homes.	As far as I am concerned 44 is fine. Run to 20/26 from 44.	Stay off the River!! We are just slowly killing this great River!		
9		Gaining right of way through Middleton could cause some really sad changes in a cute little old town. Please preserve historic buildings and that cute little park on the east side of town.	For this segment I don't have a strong negative relative to the south option, and might even prefer it if development along that section could be <u>strongly</u> discouraged.		
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					

#	<b>1. North route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>2. Existing route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>3. South route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
18					
19					
20					

## Comment Form Transcription

### February 11, 2009—Eagle Open House

### Segment 3: Duff Lane to Kingsbury Road

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?	5 Additional Comments:
1	Not needed Wasteful	<u>Best</u> No need to change.	<u>Too expensive</u> Wasteful of \$	No.	
2	Access management is a problem.	Access management is a problem.			
3	No need to divert route.	Existing Route will work Best.	No need to divert route.		
4			If chosen, please discourage development – make this a true thoroughfare.		These are all good with me – fairly equivalent.
5	<u>Best option.</u>	Too congested.	Too many bridges & environmental impacts.	No.	
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any</b> <b>issues or concerns</b> <b>with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed</b> <b>anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route</b> <b>option</b> <b>Do you have any</b> <b>issues or concerns</b> <b>with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed</b> <b>anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any</b> <b>issues or concerns</b> <b>with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed</b> <b>anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another</b> <b>option you would like</b> <b>ITD to consider and</b> <b>why?</b>	<b>5 Additional</b> <b>Comments:</b>
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					

## Comment Form Transcription

### February 11, 2009—Eagle Open House

### Segment 4: Kingsbury Road to Idaho 16

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	<b>1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
1	<u>Best option.</u>	Too congested.	Too many bridges & environmental impacts.	No.	
2		The existing route is least expensive and preferable to more traffic, albeit at a slower pace but in a direct line. South route should connect to existing route at this point.	The south route option works well from Segment 1-3 but not here.		
3			I would like the route to stay away from the Boise River. The environmental impact on this south route is too dire.		
4	The property has been platted – but not much building has been done, so the developers should be more	Too many trucks and too much traffic thru Star.	This route – either option – is too expensive and would impact the river use too much. Bridges are		

#	<b>1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
	agreeable to selling some of this property at this time.		not feasible as they are very expensive to install and maintain.		
5	Access Management	Access Management	River Crossings		
6	No better than existing and will be more expensive.	Best option.	River crossings dramatically add to costs.		
7	North Route Option 1 is a <u>major</u> route for recreational cycling. Utilizing this route will push/destroy that very beneficial use.	For this segment, the existing thoroughfare seems the best option.	I really dislike messing with the river. While it has advantages in terms of through traffic, and mitigation can be done, I think these routes are likely to be costly, and there will be pressure for development long term.		
8	Floating Feather is a major bike route that would be disrupted.		Both of these will be highly disruptive of the river corridor and will be expensive. They will also be in a flood zone. We keep shrinking the river wildlife zone. They would also make a greenbelt much less		

#	1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?	5 Additional Comments:
			desirable with all the noise.		
9	The two southern options have too many environmental constraints, but if any option would be the most viable it would be the far southern route – allowing the city to grow around a river very attractive. But for the costs and very few major issues the North Route, Option 1 may be the best route.	Yes, this route would <u>kill</u> any hopes the Star Economic Development Committee has been working on to bring businesses to town. It would also, negate the walkability improvements the city and committee have been working on with both the School District and ACHD!	See comment above (to the left.) To be able to grow a city around a river environment would really be exciting, but not at the huge expense of the rest of the state.	The North Route, Option 1 is the most cost effective.	The Star Chamber, local newspaper and the Star Economic Development Committee strongly support the North Rt., Option 1. As chairman of the transportation sub-committee the North Route, Option 1 is the best alternative. The key is to choose it fairly soon so notification and selection is known to all.
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					



#	<b>1. North route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>2. Existing route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>3. South route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
20					

## Comment Form Transcription

### February 11, 2009—Eagle Open House

### Segment 5: Idaho 16 to Ballantyne Lane

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
1	No waste of \$.	<u>Best.</u>	No. Waste of \$.	No.	
2		By far the best route and the only route that makes sense from a practical point and economically.			
3	Impact too many people/homes.	(Best Option)	Too much environmental impact.		
4	This segment should stay in the existing corridor. North Route is too disruptive to residential areas.	This is the best route for this segment. The power lines are already in place & Eagle & Eagle Sewer District have already made concessions to allow a "frontage" Road just south of the existing alignment.	Lots of bridges? This route is an environmental disaster. How many times does it cross the river? No No No		
5	N/A – This won't work but would be nice. The only way I could see this happening would	Several home owners on 44 could still use there personal driveways. We do not	I would love this but it would be too costly. Bridges, etc. & impact on the river & wildlife.	Please consider Stop Lights & Signs. Unlike Eagle Rd we run along the river "Hwy 44"	

#	1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?	5 Additional Comments:
	have to be further West & miss the majority of the neighborhoods. 2603 West State – 3 of us at least	want to lose access to our driveways. When the Road was expanded last time they took from our side. This new expansion should go to the north side. Not anymore from Us. Plus it would take out several homes. Looking forward to seeing what turns up later.		and we would have to consider it to be a slower speed limit say at least from Eagle to the outer edge of Star going West. The Wildlife on the River are always crossing and live on or near the river. Even if we say, “OK a few deer get killed” What about the people in the cars trucks hitting them. There personal loss and possible death.	
6		I prefer this option. I think H-44 should be the main people-mover (East-West) in N Ada County. Do not increase capacity on Beacon Light (or other smaller roads) without first expanding H-44 to handle today’s traffic and traffic far into the future.			Minimize stop lights. Minimize curb cuts for every property owner (require & use frontage roads). Keep speed @ 55 MPH for as much of project as possible. Use lengthy right-hand turn lanes at all major intersections.

#	<b>1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
7		We are concerned about 2 Artesian wells we have on our 3 acres that are close to the highway. Our home is 4210 Old Valley Road and our property runs clear to Highway 44. Mr. & Mrs. Marion Moore			
8	1- Yes, you are already scheduled to a realignment of Ballantine/SH44 & your proposed northern route overlays that new intersection. 2 – Are you going to really go through all those homes to reroute 44?	I believe this route to be the most logical, straighter & least expensive to build & maintain. By weaving through neighborhoods you create traffic nightmares.	Too many bridges & obstructions to the river. Flooding would be a likely result of the meandering river/highway plan & the high water table would also be a concern.		
9	I think this route is more economically feasible.	Too many trucks and traffic.	I believe this route would be too cost prohibitive as there would be 6 bridges to build – if property could be purchased ahead of time while property prices are		

#	1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?	5 Additional Comments:
			lower the North Route would be more feasible.		
10	Access management – existing subdivision proximity to high school.	Probably with some additional road and access management.	River Crossings.		
11		Best option. No reason to move route.			
12		Existing route in all cases looks fine to me. Would like to see us stay away from Floating Feather Road, make sure to add sidewalks and pedestrian safety features anyplace the road goes through town or near a school.			
13		Keep 44, just widen it. Also, I would like see <u>more</u> options for roads. Like from 16 to 20/26 – cut a road(s) from there.	Please reduce the amount of bridges.		
15			Stay out of the river zone. It can't be		

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
			duplicated whereas a subdivision that gets whacked is a dime a dozen.		
15	This one's all right as well.	This is my favorite for this segment.	Part of this route looks like it goes through the Sali property, which recently became part of a conservation easement. I really dislike this option for this segment due to the interaction with the river.		Please add more mass transit options at least this far into the project.
16		44 works fine for my needs. Going thru towns is no problem to me.	No river access, stay off the Boise River! We have way too many bridges over the river as it is. Why not just put a road to Hwy 20/26 since I hear you are going to widen it.		
17	Yes it goes through existing neighborhoods when current alignment and R.O.W. is available. Much more costly.	Make sure you coordinate with ACHD for the Ballantyne alignment.	Yes the environment and river will be greatly impacted. The cost of building a road here will be much more costly.	Please consider reducing dependence on Federal funding. If we used I.T.D. & State dollars, and partnered with local cities. We could build roads faster and less costly. Cities can give incentives for dedicating the needed R.O.W. to Developers thus cutting the costs of purchasing R.O.W.	

#	<b>1. North route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>2. Existing route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>3. South route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
18					
19					
20					

## Comment Form Transcription February 12, 2009—Middleton Open House Comment Form

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.	2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?	3. Additional comments:
1	How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Cultural sites? Wetlands? Hazardous material sites? Parks and recreation areas?	Over all flow from I-84 to Eagle Rd. Switching from north to south & back to get through the communities would be frustrating and add additional, unnecessary miles to the commute.	
2	What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Wetlands?	I wish you could find a way of <u>not</u> crossing the river so many times. That is a wildlife corridor.	
3	How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? Through Middleton Homes and businesses? Cultural sites? Wetlands? Hazardous material sites? Other – Schools & Buses	Cost – see attached	
4	What impacts would a route have on:		South alternates for Star & SH 16 to Ballantyne segments are absurd – too many river crossings. North alternate around Star (Floating Feather) would be good since speeds are too slow through Star and the pedestrians are plentiful in this area. North alternatives for Middleton & east segment take too many homes.



#	1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.	2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?	3. Additional comments:
5	What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Cultural sites?		
6	What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Cultural sites? Wetlands?	Slowing speed, increasing stop lights on hwy frustrates driving Hwy 44.	I do like southern routes to Nampa & Meridian. I'm starting to use Middleton & Linder Road more commuting to Boise area.
7	How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Other – How close road is to peoples houses.		
8	How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses?	There are too many houses close to the road.	
9	How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Parks and recreation areas?		This was very informative & interesting.
10		Maintain present Hwy 44 route – limit access – provide turnouts! Center lanes when/where needed – Enable 20/26 to be a Major E-W route – Shut the planning down! grab the shovel – talking is done – work is needed.	
11		Stay away from houses & subdivisions in order to avoid stoplights.	I mostly like the idea of the southern routes for the first three segments. Then it would be nice to switch from the southern to the northern options for the last

#	1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.	2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?	3. Additional comments:
			two segments. I would like to make the roads have adequate safety but I don't want the roads at all if its faster to drive from Middleton to the interstate back to Eagle instead of taking the highway. Thanx for listening!
12	How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses?	Costs are relative. It will be a challenge to accommodate moving traffic with preserving access to existing properties both with existing access + those who will need access. Consolidating approaches has been somewhat effective in reducing the number of access's.	
13	How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses?	We need to make sure what we do is long term solution. Regard noise, speed and safety.	
14		Would appreciate center-turn on the route. Perhaps lower speed rate to Can Ada.	
15	How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses?	Obviously the add'l traffic is of major concern for existing residents on 44. Access issues are of concern now, much less what it will be with more lanes & speed.	
16	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses?	Cost – as a tax payer cost is extremely important.	I think the south route around Middleton would work best, bad idea to go through center of town – too many Businesses, schools, park, etc.
17	How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route?	Concern about the existing rural appeal.	

#	1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.	2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?	3. Additional comments:
	What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses?		
18	What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Wetlands? Parks and recreation areas?	Leave #44 where it is. Just add turning lane on the north side of #44 at each and every road so evening and rush hour traffic wanting to turn north off #44 would let thru traffic keep on flowing.	
19	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Cultural sites? Wetlands? Parks and recreation areas?		
20		Think about future plans for Purple Sage. South Route makes the most sense.	
21	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents?	Evaluate each segment of construction as an individual route determination. In certain segments existing is best while others have north or south routes as best options.	
22		1- The en mass attach of High School vehicles on to any and all roads in their way. Lights, lanes, etc. 2- Would be nice to have maps to take home and study.	
23	What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses?	1- How about building the cheapest flattest route possible.	
24	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents?	Get it done already and quit having so many meetings.	

#	1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.	2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?	3. Additional comments:
25		Yes – Hwy. 44 has needed work for years. Get it done + stop talking about it.	
26	How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses?	Limited on and off ramps on new proposed road.	
27	What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses?	We have lived on our property for 24+ years and it has been in my husband's family for 60+ years. We would like to <u>not</u> lose what we have!	We <u>just</u> recently started receiving notices of meetings, etc... We were not able to attend meetings in the past Because we didn't know what was happening until Surveyors came to our property!
28	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Wetlands?	Noise Barrier between proposed corridor and existing homesites. Without a noise barrier the property values will be affected.	
29	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? Will this road block roads from N/S access. How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? There is homes & farms on both side of 44.	Traffic flow away from Middleton area business. I think just adding a center turn lane would add a lot of help for those turning on or off the side roads.	That could be done with just a little paint to change the Way the lanes are from the freeway to Middleton and Clear out to Lansing where the road gets narrow again.
30		Widen existing HWY 44 to 6 lanes from I-84 East to Eagle.	

#	1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.	2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?	3. Additional comments:
31	<p>Letter received from former FHWA Admin. Darrell, I recently attended an open house in Middleton where the concepts of highway improvements being planned in the SH 44 corridor were described. For what it's worth, I think your people did an outstanding job in communicating with the public. Only one Department engineer was there. The other experts were your contractors. This doesn't bother me because their joint efforts were quite commendable. Other concerned citizens I talked to at the meeting were also well pleased with your program. I don't recall seeing this kind of presentation back when I was involved (27 years ago). You are to be commended for the program. Best regards, Rich Cowdery</p>		
32	<p>ITD: Feb. 25, 2009 I live at 14738 Hwy 44 in Caldwell between Caldwell and Middleton. Where we live I don't think is much of a problem compared to EAGLE &lt; STAR and downtown Middleton.</p> <p>I know that you had to show us N &amp; S option. Which in your map section 1. Where they both would start at El Paso would really be stupid because you'd be taking peoples land for really no reason. Who in there right mind, would take a dumb curve around from El Paso to Canyon Lane and to go the same way we really don't have a problem where we are at except the speed limit. Most of our, what you'd call heavy traffic from sub divisions are through Purple Sage; to Hwy 30 we don't see it. Old Hwy 30 and 44 get a bit busy during rush hour times only and <u>we all think a stop light would help out there</u>. That is a cheaper fix than a whole road other sub division traffic goes through Middleton rd in Middleton to get to 20/26 or the freeway at exit 29 in Caldwell. Why would they come all the way to exit 25, I-84 when it is closer for them to go that way instead? It will be out of there way to get to Boise.</p> <p>Purple sage would be a great over pass extension. There is already a bridge on I-84 and purple sage. It wouldn't take as much money to put in an exit so the subdivision can easily get onto the freeway, trucks easier assess to Boise without going all the way around. It would be easier to get to the golf course. More open land than cutting into people's houses and homes. It can be connected to Hwy 16, Beacon light etc. The by pass can still get to Middleton &amp; (Star rd) easier by Dewey or Cemetery rd. Emmett rd.</p> <p>Willis and Emmett will be the New Middleton High School. This way the traffic still won't be bad if it is at PS (Purple Sage.) If you put North option then it will still be congested at the school when it is built. Coming this year by what I was told. PS will also bypass Star and the back side of Eagle.</p> <p>If you widen Hwy 44 there are many Houses with septic systems in the way. Four right in my area. Bypassing on PSage you have room to make it</p>		

#	1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.	2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?	3. Additional comments:
			<p>beautiful for Idaho tourists. Also N &amp; S is going through a (South option) Curtis Park and (North option) a animal refugee by Raymond Dr. Flood zone in the south option.</p> <p>Purple Sage is also easy to go clear through to the other 20/26 through Notus to get to Parma and Nyssa. Easy access for the beet trucks and other farm trucks for farmers harvest time. We have many farmers in this Parma, Notus, Middleton, Farm Way road area. You could make the Exit bigger for the <b>Over size loads</b> so that they don't have to go up and over and around the small overpasses just to get around all these lights,exits etc. I'm talking about the <b>wind towers, Yachts etc.</b></p> <p>Purple Sage and country side is growing out there and in time will need this entrance to the freeway. So the time you get the money I would seriously consider doing this PS exit to I /84 instead of hassling with Hwy 44, Than curving around and around all the way to 84 to Boise Your options looked like an hour glass. Why bounce in and out. Don't forget when the snow plows have snow removal that you should also think about. A straight road would be way better than curves. You would have one straight path. The south side also would go through a new developing Southwick Development housing area also Taylor Ridge housing development. Plus you would destroy the beauty of the river area. The river floods quite often. We have lots of wildlife on Channel Drive and River Rd. I don't want to see that gone.</p> <p>Since we don't have the problem on Hwy 44 option 1 as the others I or We are asking you to please start at the problem area first. <u>We don't want anything changed except the speed limit to 45 mph.</u></p> <p>We have had accidents but that is usually a blow out, sun in there eyes, or not paying attention to the Stone Lane coming off the hill to Middleton. They catch speed up on the hill down and if someone is turning they lock up there breaks and can't do anything but hit the back end of the turning car. They just go to fast. We have joggers, bikers on Hwy 44 so it is unsafe for the posted 55 mph but they go 60 to 85 most of the time. I know the 85 due to asking why they got the ticket. Or after they wreck they say they were speeding.</p> <p>We have owned this place since 1950. My grandparents bought it from a man and lady Elmer and Marie Buller. I grew up here – Jarita. In 1989 my husband and I bought it from my grandmother Hazel Lammey. Found out when we came back from the military that Elmer and Marie goes to the Church we started attending in 2001. I found the paperwork and we had a nice time talking. Also a funny thing, when my grandparents lived on Canyon Hill there had neighbors that drove them crazy. So both parties left canyon hill to get away from each other just to find themselves neighbors once again. They live on Stone lane down the way from us. When my family bought this place Hwy 44 didn't go up the hill to exit 25 to Hwy 30. It ended at my place which 1 acre of it was the Caldwell city dump. We have had Indian artifacts. We have the Oregon Trail here. Don't destroy the history. It used to be the Fruit Dale Farms. There were lots of fruit trees here. Now they are almost all gone. Vanished, I don't want to see this land vanish due to stupidity, or greedy people to make money. If Idaho is to be beautiful Hwy 44 and PS should not be industrial so the</p>

#	1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.	2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?	3. Additional comments:
	<p>So the tourist will spend time and money to visit Idaho.            If you widen Hwy 44 not to do four lanes and a turning lane is the section 1 zone. That would really be road kill. It isn't that busy. I still can get out of my driveway with ease. Good Luck with the right decision. Preparing for the future would be Purple Sage express way. So go from here Boise to Nyssa to there. Please give this to the right person for the roads. I don't have a printer on this computer so I am emailing it to a lot of people. Thank you for your help getting this to the right people. It says to send it to <b>ATTENTION: Public involvement coordinator</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Idaho Transportation dept            Po box 7129            Boise, Idaho 83707-9933</p> <p>Thank You,            Jarita Augerot 208-989-7373            &amp; Merle Augerot, Kyle Augerot 21 years &amp; Jared Augerot of 17.</p>		
33	<p>Yes, I do have several concerns with the South Route Option. The South Route Option from Middleton to Eagle is not good. My main concerns are the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More of the population between the Boise River and the foothills along the 16 mile corridor under discussion live north of the existing Highway 44 than south of Highway 44. Because the majority of people would have to cross the existing highway to get down to the South Route, the North Route makes more sense. To travel to the South Route would add unnecessary commute and travel time, unnecessary congestion, and unnecessary exhaust pollution. Though the extra travel may not seem like much, the wear on our roads will also be extraneous. The North Option is the better option because the population centers are there and there will be less "crossover" traffic if folks can readily access the new North Route. Additionally, the travel time for those people in the North Route area will decrease if they can just "hop on" the North Route with better accessibility. The traffic will flow more readily if the North Route Option is utilized.</li> <li>2. The South Option is too near the river and the riparian areas that surround the Boise River. There are too many river crossings (bridges) outlined in the South Route Option. Not only will this inhibit the natural look of our Boise River, but it costs extensively more in engineering fees <u>and</u> in construction fees to construct bridges and roads, as opposed to just roads. Please keep the project simple and select the <i>North Option</i>.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for your kind consideration and please be sure to include my comments in the Administrative Record. I would be happy to elaborate on these concerns too, so if you have additional questions, please contact me.</p> <p>Robyn Lockett, 10050 Gabica St., Middleton, ID 83644, (208) 830-3418</p>		

#	1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.	2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?	3. Additional comments:
34	<p>BEAUTIFUL!!!!!! The maps are perfect for our needs. With clarity we were able to see the areas being studied for the Highway 44 Corridor. The Southern Options in the Star and Middleton areas would impact properties that we own, if they were the preferred options. It does appear the Southern Option has the most environmental issues as well as the costs involved (possibly prohibitive) in the constuction of the multiple river crossings. The Northern or Existing Options seem to be more economical with less issues.</p> <p>We very much appreciate your efforts and look forward to meeting you at an upcoming meeting.</p> <p>Charlene Phillips</p>		



**Comment Form Transcription**  
**February 12, 2009—Middleton Open House**  
**Segment 1: I-84 to Canyon Lane**

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
1		I think the existing route would be the best option. This is assuming it can be improved upon: turning lane so that traffic is not slowed down when people want to get off the highway. A stoplight at Hwy 44 & Emmett Rd. might be a good improvement.			
2		I would hate to see widening that would bring traffic closer to my residence which is already close to road.			
3		Main route – Good Widen Road./Need middle turning lanes.			

#	<b>1. North route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>2. Existing route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>3. South route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
4	Our houses at this end are all too close to the road. If it is widened, I'll have the highway going right through y front step!			Buy my property and demolish it. I will not be able to live there and/or sell it.	
5	Seems best.	Could widen add light at old highway 30 turn into high speed limited access.	Thru existing developed area.		
6	Yes – Go further North to Willis Road – Myself & one another proposed this route at the last public display. Heck – Go further North to Sand Hollow and head East – We already have an interchange there.	Yes – my property is 14852 Hwy 44 – directly across Hwy 44 is vacant – <u>for now</u> . Commercial is planning to be constructed. If you're going to do it – delay will only compound the acquisition issues. Are the (Hwy dept) requiring new developments to incorporate turn lanes and center lanes to accommodate increase traffic and congestion??		Best option → Maintain present routes – limit access as much as possible – Construct turn outs and center lanes where needed and lower our taxes. Our taxes are so high now and getting a lot higher – there's no way we'll be able to drive anyway – Sic Sic.	By making 20-26 a major E-West and improving Hwy 44 – we are good – “close up shop” and grab the shovel.

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
7	I prefer a north route compared to south. I feel it would have less impact being further from the river.	*first choice I believe it's preferable to stay with the existing route. It's already there in place and would have less impact on existing homes.	On the south route it seems that too many homes are impacted, as well as wildlife. If you do have a south route, you should go further south.		
8	- Topography Issues - Farmland/Development Conflicts	+ Preferred option – has least amount of proximity, secondary & (___) impacts.	- Doesn't make sense with Middleton Trans. Plan & Alt Route?		
9		No – This appears to be the logical way.			
10		It would be foolish to change this part, all you need to do is widen and improve.			
11	X	Please put a center turning lane all the way from Ballantyne Lane to I-84. Also on the North side of #44 all the way from Ballantyne Lane to I-84 put a right hand turning lane to	X		

#	1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?	5 Additional Comments:
		accommodate up to 8 to 10 cars at each and every existing roadway. This way if this could be considered there would not have to be any right a way to purchase and please leave #44 on its existing route.			
12		Use existing route where not in the city.			
13	This route does not connect or work with topography nor the proposed alternate route around Middleton.	This one appears most logical contingent upon R of W width, avoiding landlocking properties etc.	This section does not appear necessary nor cost effective if the Middleton Alternate route is moving forward.	No	
14	Purple Sage Road would go through with the least amt. Of expense and changing property lines. Just designate a truck route and put up signage for out of town people.	Just a center lane all the way from freeway to town with built in turn lanes would keep traffic flowing without a lot of expense. Could be done now.	The South route option is the most convenient to and from other towns. I don't know if you have thought about Middleton's new high school open 2012	I would like to see an extension of two areas Hwy 44 thru to 20/26 across the freeway. Also Emmett road extended with a bridge for local access to Caldwell and the	

#	<b>1. North route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>2. Existing route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>3. South route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
			when this project is set to begin.	20/26 area without having to go around Freeway or Middleton.	
15	No objection.	No objection	The City of Caldwell objects to this alignment as it runs through the area of impact, residential developments, and, possibly the Floodplain of the Boise River.		

#	1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?	5 Additional Comments:
16	<p>E-mail comments received from Joy Johnson on 2/23/2009.</p> <p>I would like to comment on the proposed route from I-84 to Canyon Road. I believe that widening the existing highway makes the most sense, and is the least disruptive to homes, wildlife, and farm land.</p> <p>Highway 30 and I-84 already are easily accessed by residents at this end of the valley. As the traffic increases in the east end of the valley more residents at this end will likely seek employment to the west. Easy access to that end on the valley and to eastern Oregon will likely become drawing cards for this area. Adding a by-pass at this end of highway 44 is not needed when widening the road and adding traffic lights will allow traffic to flow very well - even with a lot more growth in the area.</p> <p>I was shocked to find out that one of the proposed routes went right over our neighbor's house, and neither they nor us had been personally notified of the meetings. We received notices in the mail containing the plot maps for all of the subdivisions that have been proposed and built in this area, yet did not receive any notice that our property was potentially being considered for purchase through eminent domain. This does not seem right. Our voices should be heard and our opinions sought out. I will be watching the proceedings closely from now on.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>				
17			Yes! This route goes right through our home and property, all three and one-half acres of it.	We think that the existing Hwy. 44 option makes the most sense.	We just learned of this corridor plan today, February 22, 2009. We're surprised that we haven't been notified of meetings since the South option involves our home.
18					
19					

#	<b>1. North route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>2. Existing route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>3. South route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
20					

**Comment Form Transcription**  
**February 12, 2009—Middleton Open House**  
**Segment 2: Canyon Lane to Duff Lane**

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
1			This is the route I feel would be best. I think a bypass around Middleton is necessary despite which option is chosen. I do not feel that the existing highway could be expanded enough to accommodate traffic passing through and city access traffic safely. It is already nearly impossible to get through town during peak traffic times.		Whichever route is considered needs to be consistent. I think it would create a lot of additional miles to be driven if the corridor switches from a north bypass to south, then back to north...(or vice versa). To keep traffic away from the river around Star and Eagle, maybe a northern bypass from I-84 to Eagle would be best.
2		If you keep the present route, a turn lane in the center would relieve most of the traffic at	The southern route would make more sense esp. since I think you already have		



#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
		this time.	purchased right of ways.		
3	This route would be my third choice as it would actually seem to be the most costly – uprooting many subdivision and family homes.	This may be the least costly, although there may be some historic buildings to be lost in the widening. However, there are a # of small businesses along this route which have closed up shop. A serpentine of the existing route + the south route may be the least amount of trouble for both existing businesses and cost. The downtown needs traffic to survive the drop of shoppers should a route to the south be the only option.	A good time to buy up land for the highway if the route is chosen. However, who do you help first, the landowner or the business man who provides the majority of local employment.	As a school bus driver, I would like to see the combined use of the 44 state highway system due to lower costs. I would also like to see the road serpentine through the area to afford both greater + easier access to many properties. Caldwell, Middleton area has the room to spread out and the immediate + easy access to I-84 will become a serious problem. We do not want another <u>Eagle Rd.</u> We do already have some existing roadway right-of-ways along the 44 corridor. Are they also in place through Middleton, but have the corridor right-of-	

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
				ways been ignored?	
4	Takes too many homes.	Would be difficult to widen through downtown.	This one is the best for this area. Gets thru traffic out of the downtown area and makes that area more pedestrian friendly.	No.	
5	This option will not work with topography + alternate route.	Best option in conjunction with proposed alternate route.	If this is aligned with projected alternate route this works.	No.	
6			South route makes sense. We need to get traffic out of Middleton. We will need to consider access. We may want to consider a cloverleaf at Middleton Rd.	We need to use existing routes except through Middleton. Widening 44 through town would be devastating.	We will need to have noise barriers around town. Widening existing routes through town is not going to make traffic move! We Must Bypass!!
7	Would be good option for Middleton by-pass.		Water table high.		
8	More impact on existing subs.	Thru town – need high speed limited access route.	South option best.		
9	- Parcel Splits - Community Cohesion - Noise Impacts	- Speed Limits - Access Issues - Air Quality	- Wetlands, Riparian + Best Route for City Plan		

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
10	Yes I think this would be a better route. There are less residents affected.	Why not widen the existing 44?	Yes, but I do not think that what I have to say will not make any difference. Where the developers give land to the city of Middleton for this Hwy I do not think that it will change for what I have to say Thank You		
11	We really don't believe that this is really a viable option. It looks good, but would you really consider buying all those homes? I would prefer a north route further from the river; but don't feel that ITD is really considering this option (it seems token).	The existing route is truly the best option. You already have 2 existing lanes. The people that live on 44 already have chosen to live on a busy highway. ITD already has domain over hwy. 44.	Of course this is bothersome to us, as it goes right through our property and would landlock us from another portion of our property. It is difficult to feel our concerns matter, as you are already preserving land for the southern route. We realize there has to be growth, but feel the existing 44 route would be the best route with the least impact to homeowners etc.		

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
12	I prefer this route but believe it's not realistic. I really feel this route was only suggested to make the project appear to have multiple options.	Perfect! Use the existing 44 – widen a bit if needed. The current residents are used to the noises the road and cars make.	I am concerned about the wetlands, wildlife and the current peace and quiet that I am used to. This route would affect me and my family greatly. My property borders my parents and this route goes right through our property. Our quality of life would diminish.		
13		Leave the highway #44 where it is. Put in center lane and right hand turn lanes. Not too long but long enough to make space for W & S vehicles so other traffic can keep moving that is going farther west on #44 all way to I-84.			
14	Many homes displaced.	Good option big impact on business.	Best option.		
15	No.	Too expensive!	Bypassing Middleton seems to be the most		

#	<b>1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
			cost effective, as there isn't much development.		
16			This is the only one that makes sense – Its been voted on several times. Why don't you get busy and do it. Its been needed for at least 10 years.		
17		No – This is the best way, however the south bypass of Middleton needs to be done. The south bypass should return to the existing 44 before or east of Emmett Rd.			
18	Yes, major cost & waste of good farm ground.	This is by far the best option, only requiring a short by-pass around Middleton. The best by pass option would be on the south side of town toward the river. There is already a clear swath of ground	Yes, major cost & waste of good farm ground.		I believe the existing route is in the best interest for all parties. The north & south one only blowing smoke.

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
		through over ½ the access needed.			
19	Too much expensive subdivisions to buy around. The way the roads are planned now makes it hard to get school buses close to the students. Would a through road make it more dangerous than now.	You need a bridge over pass near the school to cut down on the danger of kids darting in and around traffic as they do now. Its crazy before & after school. Speed should be 15 to 20 during those times.	The development of the subdivision and the extra speed of through traffic we need this by-pass but a bridge at Emmett would by-pass all those trucks that are going to the gravel pits on the south side of the river.	How about a combination. Why does it have to be straight through. 20/26 goes straight if they need to get to Boise. Traffic coming from the North and West filtering into 44 traffic keeps the road flowing it seems. Just the center land clear through would keep traffic from backing up and blocking traffic more than usual. Purple Sage is a very through road if you need to enlarge a road and it can get all the way to Hwy 16 if a person needs.	
20	It seems that the North Route goes directly through subdivisions	I think something needs to be done. The traffic through town	I think that if the object is to by-pass Middleton at this point		

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
	and right next to a grade school. Would traffic really be lessened by making this new road? All the people from these neighborhoods and school/school buses would have to cross this route to go anywhere.	can really get backed up, especially when school is beginning and ending.	is the goal, this south route is the best option. It seems to go around Middleton rather than directly through it.		

**Comment Form Transcription**  
**February 12, 2009—Middleton Open House**  
**Segment 3: Duff Lane to Kingsbury Road**

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
1		I do not see any reason to build an alternate route unless this route just cannot be expanded on to accommodate future traffic. At this point, traffic west of Star, except w/i Middleton City limits, moves well. It could be enhanced with a center turn lane running the length of the highway.			
2		It would be more economical sense to widen the existing route. The other routes are too invasive.			
3		Good road way less traffic	Water table too high, soils conditions bad		



#	1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?	5 Additional Comments:
		Maintain speed, limit access.	for roadway development.		
4	New subdivision in area.	Existing structures.	No issues.		
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Parcel Splits</li> <li>- Secondary &amp; Culmative Impacts</li> <li>- Noise Impacts</li> <li>- Irrigation/Wetlands</li> </ul>	+ Best route as long as avoids hist. properties.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Wetlands</li> <li>- Irrigation</li> <li>- Farmland</li> </ul>		
6	Too much development in this route.	Dependent upon R of W width and accommodating existing properties as relates to approaches.	N/A	No.	
7		Keep this route, just widen it and control access.			
8	Big cost.	Good option but big impact on business.	Looks best.		
9		Leave here & widen.			
10	Yes	No – this is the way that looks most feasible + cost effective.	Yes		
11		To me this route seems the most cost effective. The state has the Right	2 <sup>nd</sup> Choice		

#	<b>1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
		of Way.			
12	If it doesn't offset corner of Duff Ln + 44 then go for it.	Our property begins at the corner of Hwy 44 and Duff Lane. We are afraid of losing our home. We have two homes on our property one of which is being used by relatives who are both disabled – one who is a Vietnam Vet. If we lose our property to a write of way we will all be without homes.	If it doesn't affect the corner of Hwy 44 + Duff Lane then go for it!	If the route is widened where it currently exists there is another option of taking the right away from the commercial property across the street so we won't lose our home. Plus that would straighten the road as it goes in to town.	We feel like our comments will make no difference because you all are going to do what you have already planned to do. All the deals that have been made with businesses, homebuilders, etc. kind of makes us feel like we really are just being placated because the process has to happen to justify finally making the changes.
13	Yes, cost & waste of good farm ground.	This is the best option, you already own most of right of way so the cost would be reasonable. Only requiring the route around Star & Middleton to be banged out.	Yes, cost & waste of farm ground.		When the existing right of way was bought 50+ years ago people were told that some day 44 would need to be a four lane road. That idea is coming to pass, so it only make sense to use the ground that is

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
					there.
14	If a person needs to get to Boise from Duff, Lansing, Kingsbury, etc. they still need to get onto Hwy 44. Would this North (or the South option) really help decrease traffic issues?	Perhaps just widening the existing road might be more cost-effective and lessen traffic. If you travel Hwy 44 as it is now during the middle of the day (I've done this frequently) it doesn't seem like there is much traffic at all. I can get from Middleton to Eagle in 20-25 minutes on a week day around 10 am. If the problem is at rush hour, why not just widen the existing road and make it 4 or 5 lanes?			
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					

## Comment Form Transcription

### February 12, 2009—Middleton Open House

### Segment 4: Kingsbury Road to Idaho 16

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?	5 Additional Comments:
1	North option 2 seems to be the best northern option. Option 1 bypasses Star quite a bit.		South option 2 seems to be the best southern option and the best overall option. It appears that it would be the most beneficial to traffic flow and would have minimal impact on the river in comparison to the southern option #1.		
2		To leave this route thru the city of Star would become a bottleneck.	#2 This makes more sense than the other option. Try not to cross the river so many times.		
3		Good route widening needed. No speed reduction or hwy increased access.	Water table + soils conditions make this route costly.		
4	- North Route Option	- Too Slow	- Too costly with		

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
	#1 – Not good for SH16 connection & ACHD's study on extension of Floating Feather/Purple Sage Study. + North Route Option #2 – best option <b>if</b> ITD <u>mitigates noise</u> & controls access.	- Air Quality Impacts	bridge options. - Riparian, (___), Wetlands		
5	North 1 – best North 2 – elementary school – existing subdivision	Star.	1 wetland fewer crossings best* wetland many river crossings		
6	I like this option best – least impact ties in better w/access thru Eagle.	I like moving the main access away from the center of Star. Allows Star to develop something.	I think we should avoid crossing the river.		
7	This should be looked at in coordination with ACHD's idea to connect Beacon Light to Purple Sage. Perhaps this could move north to facilitate better east west traffic	See above. (North route option response.)	Does not look practical.		

#	1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?	5 Additional Comments:
	& take pressure off 44.				
8			This route crosses the Boise River several times. Bad idea in terms of cost. Also would through a road over the most aesthetically pleasing part of this corridor.		
9	Option #1 looks best Option #2 big impact on homes	Big impact to business.	Both south most expensive.		
10	This one: Existing would put too much traffic in town. South would be going through too much housing.				
11		No – This is the only feasible way, however if there's a way to bypass Star it would be good.			
12					
13					
14					
15					

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any</b> <b>issues or concerns</b> <b>with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed</b> <b>anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route</b> <b>option</b> <b>Do you have any</b> <b>issues or concerns</b> <b>with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed</b> <b>anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any</b> <b>issues or concerns</b> <b>with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed</b> <b>anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another</b> <b>option you would like</b> <b>ITD to consider and</b> <b>why?</b>	<b>5 Additional</b> <b>Comments:</b>
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					

## Comment Form Transcription

### February 12, 2009—Middleton Open House

### Segment 5: Idaho 16 to Ballantyne Lane

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
1	A northern branch cutting off at Ballantyne that connects to Hwy 16 north of Floating Feather would likely make a huge reduction to traffic on Hwy 44 between Eagle & Star.	I think this would be the best route to keep. This is assuming it can be expanded to 4 lanes with a center turn lane along the entire length of the highway.	Both southern routes look as if they will be overly expensive and potentially harmful to the river.		
2	I think this would be your best option too much unnecessary farm land destruction.	Just widen the existing 44.	Too many river crossings.		
3	Seems unnecessary.	Keep existing road to then merge onto alternate route thru Star allow for bike/walk lanes to connect Star/Eagle.	Seems unnecessary.		
4	To costly to purchase land.	The route seems to work just need	Water table + soils conditions add cost to		



#	1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?	5 Additional Comments:
		widening.	this route.		
5		No problem.	Water way/Wetland incursion.		
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Schools</li> <li>- New Development/Farml and</li> <li>- Secondary &amp; Culmative development</li> </ul>	Best Option Mitigate or avoid historic if any.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bridges over River</li> <li>- Eagle Island State Park</li> <li>- Wetlands</li> </ul>		
7		Make a five lane with this existing route. It appears there's enough ground with the existing right of way. This looks like the most cost effective way.		No	
8		This one for sure. Going South would be a joke. North isn't much better.			
9	Many new homes.	Best route.	Most expensive?		
10			This route crosses the Boise River 6 times. Seems to me a bad idea in terms of initial		

#	<b>1. North route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>2. Existing route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>3. South route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
			cost and ongoing maintenance requirements for the bridges. Also could hurt the natural aesthetics of that area.		
11	I think we should use existing route on this section. Use existing route on this section and just widen it with turn lanes – only bypass the cities.				I think using existing route makes more sense than having to involve more property outside the cities.
12					
13					
15					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					



# SUMMARY

## Idaho 44 Corridor Preservation Study

### February 2009 Open Houses



Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho  
Idaho Transportation Department District 3



Prepared by RBCI

**Table of Contents**

---

Introduction.....3

Preparation .....4

Open House Format .....4

Notification .....5

Summary of Comments .....6

    Eagle Open House.....6

    Middleton Open House .....11

Appendix.....16

---

## Introduction

---

The Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) and Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (COMPASS) hosted public open houses on Feb. 11 and 12, 2009 to receive input on the Idaho 44 Corridor Preservation Study.

The purpose of the open houses was to provide the public with an opportunity to:

- Receive a study update, learn the next steps, and how to participate.
- Review and give input on potential north, south and existing route options for Idaho 44.
- Review and comment on criteria that will be used to screen (evaluate) route options.
- Provide additional comments.

The open houses were the third in a series of public involvement opportunities for this study. Public input will help ITD and COMPASS make critical decisions about the future design of Idaho 44 and the role of the corridor in the regional transportation system. The highway runs from the city of Eagle, through the downtown areas of Star and Middleton, and ends at Interstate 84 in Canyon County. It is one of only three east/west highways carrying traffic between Boise and Caldwell.

The completed study will include:

- List of needed improvements within this corridor.
- How much right-of-way is necessary to improve the corridor.
- An approved environmental document.
- An access management plan that will identify the number of locations and driveways and intersections on Idaho 44.

---



## **Preparation**

---

The Idaho 44 corridor is approximately 15 miles long. Open houses were scheduled in two locations for the convenience of attendees.

- The Feb. 11 open house was held at Eagle City Hall, 660 E. Civic Dr. in Eagle, from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.
- The February 12 open house was held at the Middleton Fine Arts Building, 115 W. Main St. in Middleton, from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

In preparation for the events, a detailed open house plan was created that outlined the:

- Format of the open houses.
- Notification.
- Displays and materials needed.
- Questions that would be asked on the comment forms.
- Ways public input would be used in the decision-making process.
- Deadlines for each step.

Open house staff included representatives from ITD and COMPASS; the cities of Eagle, Middleton and Star; URS Washington Division; Parametrix; Bionomics and RBCI.

---



## **Open House Format**

---

Attendees were encouraged to drop in any time between 4 p.m. and 7 p.m. Upon arrival, participants were greeted and given a brief explanation of the open house format.

Informational display stations were placed throughout the room and staffed by technical experts. In addition, five large maps were placed on tables in the back of the room. Each map had a corresponding comment sheet.

Attendees were directed to review the maps, ask questions of study experts, and fill out a comment sheet for any and all segments relevant to them. Every participant received a general comment sheet and was encouraged to give input.

---



## Notification



---

Notification for these open houses occurred in several ways:

- **Postcard** – A postcard was produced that included the open house dates along with study information. The postcard was mailed to nearly 15,717 people. Of those, 14,500 were delivered by mail carrier route to people who live and work along the corridor. The other 1,200 were sent to a database that included property owners, Corridor Preservation Committee members, developers, agencies and others who have expressed an interest in this project. (*see Appendix*)
- **E-mail notification** – COMPASS sent an electronic version of the postcard to its *Communities in Motion* database of 1,500 people.
- **Media** – A media release about the open houses was sent the week before the open house. (*see Appendix*)
- **Newspaper display ads** – A display ad ran in The Idaho Statesman, the Idaho Press-Tribune, the Valley Times and the Eagle Independent the week of Feb. 8. (*see Appendix*)
- **Web site** – Open house notification was placed on the Idaho Transportation Department home page ([www.itd.idaho.gov](http://www.itd.idaho.gov)) and on the study Web page ([www.itd.idaho.gov](http://www.itd.idaho.gov), click on Projects, click on Southwest Idaho, click on Idaho 44 Corridor Preservation Study).
- **Study partners' Web sites** – Open house notification was sent to COMPASS, Canyon County, city of Eagle, city of Middleton, and city of Star to be placed on their homepages.
- **Sandwich boards** – Sandwich boards notifying motorists about the open houses were placed in eight locations along the corridor.

---

## Summary of Comments

---

In all, there were 201 attendees at the Idaho 44 Corridor Preservation Study open houses and 175 comment forms were received. Comment forms were available for general and targeted comments for the five segments of Idaho 44. Everyone received a general comment form, but attendees were directed to select targeted comment forms based on corridor segments.

The following summary is a general overview of the documented comments and represents the main themes and opinions expressed by the public. It is not intended to be statistically reliable. A verbatim transcription of comments is included in the Appendix.

---

### Eagle Open House Comments Feb. 11, 2009

In all, 68 returned comment sheets at the Eagle open house.

- 22 returned a general comment sheet.
- 6 returned a Segment 1 comment sheet.
- 9 returned a Segment 2 comment sheet.
- 5 returned a Segment 3 comment sheet.
- 9 returned a Segment 4 comment sheet.
- 17 returned a Segment 5 comment sheet.

#### GENERAL COMMENT SHEET

**1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.**

Seventeen responded to this question. Many checked multiple categories.

In order of frequency, respondents checked the following categories:

Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? (9)

How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? (8)

What impacts would a route have on:

- Homes and businesses.



- Wetlands. (5)
- Parks and recreation areas. (4)
- Cultural sites. (3)
- Other (schools, north-south access). (2)
- Hazardous material sites. (1)

---

**2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?**

---

Most of the 22 responses to this question raised issues to consider. Of these, 20 responses suggested specific improvements. The most often-repeated improvements were:

- Provide more public transportation options: cycling options, light rail, plan pedestrian and bike safety improvements.
- If possible, build a route around downtown areas (Star and Middleton).
- Safety and traffic signals for safety, plan well for access points.

---

**3. Additional comments**

---

There were nine responses to this question. Comments included:

- Bike paths and walking paths are a must.
- Improved transportation alternatives (buses, light rail) need to be considered in a transit corridor; look ahead to the future.
- Traffic lights need to be adequate for safety. Plan signal spacing, look at u-turns.

---

**SEGMENT-SPECIFIC COMMENT SHEETS**

The following questions were repeated for each of the five segments.

1. North route option: Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?
2. Existing route option: Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?
3. South route option: Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?
4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider? Why?
5. Additional comments

---

**Segment 1: I-84 to Canyon Lane**

---

Six returned a comment sheet about Segment 1. Many commented on multiple route options.

1. **Three of the six commented on the north option.** One person had no issues or concerns. The other two comments gave concerns:
  - No need to divert the route.
  - Private homes and land on the proposed route would be an issue.
2. **Five of the six commented on the existing option.** Frequent comments included:
  - This is the best option.
  - All options must allow for easy access for cyclists.
3. **Five of the six commented on the south option.** Frequent comments included:
  - Stay off the river, preserve the greenbelt, no need to divert this route.
  - This route would cause problems for cyclists that use this area.
4. **No one identified another option.**
5. **No one gave additional comments.**

---

**Segment 2: Canyon Lane to Duff Lane**

---

Nine returned a comment sheet about Segment 2. Many commented on multiple route options.

1. **Six of the nine commented on the north option.** Frequent comments included:
  - Not a good option; goes through too many properties.
  - Access is a problem.
2. **Seven of the nine commented on the existing option.** Frequent comments included:
  - Reduce impacts to businesses (bypass downtowns).
  - Route could negatively affect Middleton.
  - Need an alternate route to expedite east-west traffic.
3. **All nine commented on the south option.** All nine seemed to favor the route. Comments included:
  - Best choice so far, viable.
  - Stay off the river.
  - Would prefer as little development as possible.
4. **No one identified another option.**

5. **One gave additional comments**, saying the south option was the best.

---

**Segment 3: Duff Lane to Kingsbury Road**

---

Five returned a comment sheet about Segment 3. Many commented on multiple route options.

1. **Four of the five commented on the north option.** One person thought it was the best option. Three of the four disliked the option for the following reasons:
  - No need to divert the route (2).
  - Access management would be a problem.
2. **Four of the five commented on the existing option** and disagreed whether it was the best. Two said it was the best. The other two disliked the option for the following reasons:
  - Too congested.
  - Access would be a problem.
3. **Four of the five commented on the south option.** All four disagreed with the route. Comments included:
  - Too many environmental impacts; need to discourage development.
  - No need to divert this route and it would be too expensive.
4. **Two of the five commented on another option**, saying there was no other option.
5. **One of the five gave additional comments**, including:
  - All routes seem equivalent.
  - Minimize stop lights; minimize curb cuts for every property owner.
  - Add more mass transit.

---

**Segment 4: Kingsbury Road to Idaho 16**

---

Nine people returned comment sheets about Segment 4. Many commented on multiple route options.

1. **Six of the nine commented on the north option.** Two supported the option. Four thought it was not a good option for the following reasons:
  - Major bike route.
  - No better than existing route and will be expensive.
  - Access management would be a problem.
  - Fewer problems with land that is already developed.
2. **Six of the nine commented on the existing option** and disagreed whether it was the best. Three said it was the best. The other three disliked the option for the following reasons:
  - Too congested.
  - Access would be a problem.

- Would kill any hopes of Star Economic Development Committee has been working on to bring businesses to town.
- 3. **All nine commented on the south option.** All were in agreement against the route. Comments included:
  - Too many environmental impacts with the river.
  - Need to discourage development.
  - Route would be too expensive.
- 4. **No one identified another route option.**
- 5. **One gave additional comments.** The Star Chamber, local newspaper and Star Economic Development Committee voiced support for the north route option, and asked for a quick decision and notification.

---

**Segment 5: Idaho 16 to Ballantyne Lane**

---

Seventeen returned comments about Segment 5. Many commented on multiple route options.

1. **Nine of the 17 commented on the north option.** Respondents were almost all against this route. Seven respondents thought it was not a good option. One said it was the best; one was neutral. Comments included:
  - It would impact too many homes and people.
  - Waste of money.
  - Best option; more economically feasible.
2. **Sixteen of the 17 commented on the existing option.** Fifteen agreed it was the best option. One said it would involve too much traffic and the other was concerned with their property in light of this option. Other comments included:
  - Best route; most logical.
  - No reason to move route; just widen it.
  - Too many trucks and traffic.
3. **Twelve of the 17 commented on the south option.** Most were in agreement. Comments included:
  - Too many environmental impacts with the river.
  - Need to discourage development.
  - Route would be too expensive.
4. **Two of the 17 commented on another option.** One said there was no other option. The other wanted stoplights and wildlife crossings to be considered.
5. **Two of the 17 gave additional comments.** Add more mass transit options and manage access (minimize stop lights and access points).

---

## Middleton Open House Comments

### Feb. 12, 2009

In all, 107 returned comment sheets at the Middleton open house.

- 34 returned a general comment sheet.
- 17 returned a Segment 1 comment sheet.
- 20 returned a Segment 2 comment sheet.
- 14 returned a Segment 3 comment sheet.
- 11 returned a Segment 4 comment sheet.
- 11 returned a Segment 5 comment sheet.

### GENERAL COMMENT SHEET

**1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you:**

Twenty-three responded to this question. Many checked multiple categories.

In order of frequency, respondents checked the following categories:

- |  |      |
|--|------|
| What impacts would a route have on homes and businesses?                   | (18) |
| How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route?                | (13) |
| What impacts would a route have on wetlands?                               | (8)  |
| Other: animals, river corridor, cycling, etc.                              | (8)  |
| Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? | (6)  |
| What impacts would a route have on:  |      |
| ▪ Parks and recreation areas.  | (4)  |
| ▪ Cultural sites.  | (3)  |
| ▪ Hazardous material sites.  | (2)  |

**2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?**

Most of 25 responses to this question raised issues to consider. All responses suggested specific improvements. The most often repeated improvements were:

- Consider cost.
- Don't cross the river so many times.
- Stay away from homes, subdivisions.

---

### **3. Additional comments**

---

There were nine responses to this question. The most often-repeated comments were:

- Too many river crossings.
- South routes would work best around the first three segments.

---

## **SEGMENT-SPECIFIC COMMENT SHEETS**

The following questions were repeated for each of the five segments.

1. North route option: Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?  
Have we missed anything?
2. Existing route option: Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?  
Have we missed anything?
3. South route option: Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?  
Have we missed anything?
4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider? Why?
5. Additional comments

---

### **Segment 1: I-84 to Canyon Lane**

---

Seventeen people returned comments about Segment 1. Many commented on multiple route options.

1. **Eight of the 17 commented on the north option.** Most did not like the route. Comments included:
  - Houses are too close to the road.
  - Route does not connect or work with topography.
  - Purple Sage Rd. would go through with least complications.
2. **Fifteen of the 17 commented on the existing option.** Eight people were in favor of this route. Two people did not like it. Other comments could not be categorized. Comments included:
  - This is the best option.
  - Widen the road; avoid land-locking properties.
3. **Seven of the 17 commented on the south option.** Comments included:
  - Route would impact homes and other property.
  - Not cost-effective.

- Most convenient route.
- 4. **Five of the 17 commented on another option.** Comments included:
  - Extend two areas: Idaho 44 to U.S. 20/26, and Emmett Road. Would provide local access to Caldwell and the U.S. 20/26 area.
  - Maintain present routes.
- 5. **One of the 17 gave an additional comment**, which supported making U.S. 20/26 a major east-west route and improving Idaho 44.

---

**Segment 2: Canyon Lane to Duff Lane**

---

Twenty returned comments about Segment 2. Many commented on multiple route options.

1. **Fourteen of the 20 commented on the north option.** The majority were against the route. Comments included:
  - Route is the most costly, not a good option.
  - Too much impact on area homes.
  - Route would ruin good farm ground.
  - Access is a problem.
2. **Seven of the 20 commented on the existing option.** Most thought this was the best option. Comments included:
  - This is the best option.
  - Widen Idaho 44.
  - Option is too expensive.
  - Something needs to be done, as traffic already backs up.
3. **Eighteen of the 20 commented on the south option**, and 11 seemed to favor the route. However, others had concerns. Comments included:
  - Best choice so far; viable.
  - What I say won't make a difference.
  - Concerns with wetlands, wildlife.
  - Costly; uses valuable farmland.
4. **Five of the 20 commented on another option.** Comments included:
  - Need to use existing routes except through Middleton.
  - What about a combination of alternatives.
5. **Three of the 20 gave additional comments**, which included:
  - Be consistent no matter what option is chosen.
  - Noise abatement will be needed; need a bypass.
  - Existing route is best.

---

**Segment 3: Duff Lane to Kingsbury Road**

---

Fourteen returned comments about Segment 3. Many commented on multiple route options.

1. **Eight of the 14 commented on the north option.** Two people had questions about the route. One person did not respond with data. Five people did not favor this option for the following reasons:
  - Too much development already on this route; subdivisions and possible parcel splits.
  - Cost is too high.
  - Noise impacts.
  - Wetlands.
  - Waste of good farmland.
2. **All 14 commented on the existing option.** Of these, 10 liked this option. Four people were concerned about the traffic, existing speed limits, structures and accommodating existing properties. One person was very concerned about losing property. Other comments included:
  - This is the best option.
  - Keep this route; just widen it.
  - Good option, but big impact on businesses.
  - Cost should be reasonable.
3. **Nine of the 14 commented on the south option.** Comments included:
  - Water table is too high (wetlands).
  - Farm ground and irrigation would be affected.
  - Looks best.
  - Not a problem if it doesn't affect corner of Idaho 44 and Duff Lane.
4. **One of the 14 commented on another option,** saying that if the existing route were widened, property should be taken from commercial side and not the residential side.
5. **Two of the 14 gave additional comments,** which included:
  - Feels like our comments don't make a difference.
  - Use ground that is currently there.

---

#### **Segment 4: Kingsbury Road to Idaho 16**

---

Eleven people returned comments about Segment 4. Many commented on multiple route options.

1. **Seven of the 11 commented on the north option.** Participants seemed split about this option. Comments included:
  - North option #1 is the best option. (2)
  - North option #2 is the best. (2)
  - Others thought this was the best option but did not distinguish between Route 1 or Route 2.



- Not good for Idaho 16 connection.
  - This option ties in best with access through Eagle.
  - Problems with existing school and subdivisions.
  - Coordination with ACHD's study of Floating Feather and Purple Sage.
2. **Eight of the 11 commented on the existing option.** Comments were divided about this option, and included:
    - Feasible, needs widening.
    - Not a good option: already too slow, bottlenecks, air quality.
    - Impact to business.
  3. **Nine of the 11 commented on the south option** and were in agreement against the route. Comments included:
    - Too many environmental impacts with the river, wetlands.
    - Too costly.
  4. **No one gave comments about another option.**
  5. **No one gave additional comments.**

---

#### **Segment 5: Kingsbury Road to Idaho 16**

---

Eleven returned comments about Segment 5. Many commented on multiple route options.

1. **Seven of the 11 commented on the north option.** Nearly all were against the route. Comments included:
  - Route would impact too many homes and people.
  - Too costly.
  - All right; best option.
2. **Nine of the 11 commented on the existing option.** All seemed to agree it was the best option. Comments included:
  - Best route; most logical.
  - No reason to move route; just widen (existing route).
  - Best route to keep; avoid interfering with historic places.
  - Going south would be a joke.
3. **Eight of the 11 commented on the south option** and were in agreement against the route. Comments included:
  - Too many river crossings.
  - Expensive.
  - Unnecessary.
4. **No one identified another option.**
5. **One of the 11 gave additional comments**, saying the existing route made more sense than involving more properties around cities.

---



## Appendix



---

- Transcription of comments
- Transcription of sign-ins
- Invitation
- News release
- Newspaper display ad
- Display boards
- Comment forms
- Open house photos